

To: Davis, Tim[TimDavis@mt.gov]
From: Miller, Johanna
Sent: Tue 6/6/2017 6:10:23 PM
Subject: PPG funding

Tim – Just want to make sure we answer the right question. On the FY 17 funds you are waiting for, is this 106 (PPG) or 319 (non-PPG) or both? My understanding is that for the 106 funds that go into the PPG your office has been told that you will be receiving \$159,180 (compared to \$160,000) last year. According to the comptroller's office and the PPG project officer, the region anticipates getting our authority to spend next week and to make grant awards the week of June 19th. Tina also indicated that she emailed Darrin Kron that we expect to have the 604(b) allocation soon.

In our re-organization to create the regional Office of Water Protection, there is now a unit focused on technical and financial services. One of my goals is to better integrate the clean water program funding into this unit's responsibilities as they have traditionally focused on the SRFs. Hopefully in future years we can quickly respond to \$ questions. Thanks for your patience.

Johanna

From: Davis, Tim [mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov]
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2017 2:40 PM
To: Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Johanna -

Yes, we applied for FY18. In addition, we are waiting for a disbursement of our FY17 PPG funding which we are hoping to receive before July 1st. It would be very helpful if you or one of your colleagues could let us know when to expect the FY17 funding and if it will be less than expected.

Thanks again,

Tim

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 2, 2017, at 2:07 PM, Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov> wrote:

Tim – thanks for checking in as I have on my to do list to get some clarity on the funding amounts, process, and timing. The individual who handles the MT PPG for EPA is out today so I won't be able to get too far but will get back with you early next week. Do you know if MT has been asked to submit or already submitted an application for FY 18 funding yet? Johanna

From: Davis, Tim [<mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov>]
Sent: Friday, June 2, 2017 1:39 PM
To: Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Johanna –

How are you? I wanted to check back in to see if you have further clarification on PPG funding amounts for this fiscal year and when we might expect to see the grant awards? Thanks again.

Have a good weekend,

Tim

From: Miller, Johanna [<mailto:Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 4:19 PM
To: Davis, Tim
Cc: Schmit, Ayn
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Tim – Following up on your question about the budget for the FY 17 PPGs. As we thought, the 10% reduction was the conservative estimate given prior to a budget being passed. While we still don't have our approved operating plan that allocates funds to the specific programs, we are expecting the water program funding levels to remain flat at FY 16 levels or see a slight reduction to accommodate the mandated approx. 1.5% rescission of funds (ie sending \$ back to the treasury).

I've been told to expect the operating plan to be complete by late next week and, by the end of May, for the Region to have a better idea of PPG funding amounts. The plan is to award grants by late June/early July.

Hope this is helpful. Take care. Johanna

From: Davis, Tim [<mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:51 PM
To: Schmit, Ayn <Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Ayn –

Yes, thanks for remember Whitefish. If we can just talk quickly about the individual variance for Whitefish, too, that would be great since it is the first individual nutrient variance application we have reviewed.

Thanks again,

Tim

From: Schmit, Ayn [<mailto:Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:49 PM
To: Davis, Tim; Miller, Johanna
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Yes, thanks- it does. I recall that you had also wanted to talk about a pending individual variance for Whitefish?

From: Davis, Tim [<mailto:TimDavis@mt.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:44 PM
To: Schmit, Ayn <Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>; Miller, Johanna <Miller.Johanna@epa.gov>
Subject: RE: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Ayn –

Hi. Yes, what you propose will be useful. I am hoping that we can also discuss your goal and philosophy as management behind the comments and I can share with you what we are hoping to get out of the comments in order to inform our final decision. I am fine if Tina is on the call, but I would like to keep the conversation at that higher level then we can go into the details and weeds next week when we have other staff on the call. Does that work for you?

Thanks,

Tim

From: Schmit, Ayn [<mailto:Schmit.Ayn@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, May 9, 2017 3:32 PM
To: Davis, Tim; Miller, Johanna
Subject: Check in on MT nutrient draft rulemaking

Tim, I wanted to run by you what we were thinking for our call with you tomorrow. I had planned on giving you a sense of the current volume of comments in our draft letter as it sits now, and briefly outlining the major comment areas- but only if that is helpful. What would you like to get from our conversation tomorrow?

Also, how would you feel about having Tina in the conversation? I was thinking of including her in case we want to jump into any of the weeds. But if you'd prefer a management-level conversation, that is fine, too. Let me know your thoughts on that.

Thanks for taking the time to talk with us at what I know is a really difficult time for you.

Ayn E. Schmit / Acting Director, Clean Water Program / EPA Region 8 / 303-312-6220 / 1595 Wynkoop Street, Denver, CO 80202

Protect our Nation's Waters <https://www.epa.gov/aboutepa/epa-region-8-mountains-and-plains>